Majority Press Releases
Fact of the Day
Speeches

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 16, 2005

THE WEEKLY CLOSER

FROM THE SENATE ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE
MAJORITY PRESS OFFICE

VOLUME 1, NUMBER 18

THE WEEK IN REVIEW…

- Explore ANWR For Sake Of Energy Security
- Inhofe Comments On New ESA Legislation
- Opening Statement Of Chairman James M. Inhofe: Hearing On EPA's Spill Prevention Control And Countermeasure Program
- Inhofe Statement On Clinton Speech In Montreal

IN CASE YOU MISSED IT…

- "Kyoto's Bill" (Editorial, *Investor's Business Daily*, December 13, 2005)
- "Martin will do anything to hold on to power" (Lee Morrison, *The Leader-Post* [Regina, Saskatchewan], December 13, 2005)
- "Defining Prosperity Down" (Jack Kemp, *The New York Sun*, December 14, 2005)

QUOTE OF THE WEEK…

"At the United Nations Climate Change Conference in Montreal, [Paul Martin] enthusiastically endorsed the Kyoto Accord even though the 'science' behind it has been largely discredited. With his personal staff of about 200, it is inconceivable that he hasn't had access to the scientific rebuttals (much of it by Canadian scholars) to this gigantic fraud. Actually, long before independent climate experts became interested in the subject, the entire Kyoto exercise was predicated on misrepresentation of the Report of the U.N.'s Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) which states:

1. That none of the studies have shown clear evidence that we can attribute observed climate changes to increases in greenhouse gases;
2. That no study has positively attributed all or part of climate change to man-made causes.

The public, and politicians who could, in those days, still plead ignorance, were exposed only to the report's blatantly political summary, to which the committee scientists had minimal input."

Lee Morrison
"Martin will do anything to hold on to power"
The Leader-Post [Regina, Saskatchewan]
December 13, 2005

EXPLORE ANWR FOR SAKE OF ENERGY SECURITY

Economic and National Security Benefits, Guaranteed Environmental Protection

Republicans and Democrats clearly have different approaches for achieving energy independence, but votes on oil exploration in Alaska demonstrate Republicans' willingness to find common sense solutions to energy needs while protecting the environment. Democrats, however, embrace a much different approach – a "wait and see" policy. The former 2004 Democrat presidential candidate, for example, wrote in a campaign letter dated March 16, 2005, "We have to put America's energy future in the hands of Americans - by inventing our way to real energy independence and having energy sources that create jobs and lower prices."

Innovation is naturally a critical component of efforts to achieve energy independence and ensure energy security. President Bush and the Congressional Majority have led the way in encouraging clean energy innovation by encouraging the development of clean coal, next generation nuclear and hydrogen technologies, among many other initiatives that will enhance our energy supply while guaranteeing a quality environment. However, as the country makes investments today for innovation tomorrow, there is a need for short-term solutions. Exploration in a remote and minute portion of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge (ANWR) offers one of those important, short-term solutions.

According to the Energy Information Administration, ANWR would produce nearly 1.5 million barrels a day or more, every day for roughly 30 years. The U.S. Geological Survey estimates that ANWR contains a mean expected value of 10.4 billion barrels of technically recoverable oil. At peak production, ANWR could produce more oil than any U.S. state, including Texas and Louisiana. Senate Energy & Natural Resources Chairman Pete Domenici outlined the economic benefit in a March 15, 2005 press release, stating that "ANWR, at peak production and at today's oil prices, would pump nearly $50 million into our economy every day. That's $18 billion a year – money that is going to foreign nations right now."

While achieving those substantial economic benefits and moving further down the path toward energy independence, environmental needs will also be met. The Department of the Interior is clear that exploration in ANWR will be limited to winter months to protect wildlife and tundra, and that strict rules to protect streams, rivers, springs and wetlands will be in place and enforced.

Strictest Environmental Standards

Interior Secretary Gale Norton made clear in recent press releases that modern energy production techniques would be employed under the strictest environmental requirements ever imposed on energy development:

December 12, 2005

> Energy production techniques are as different today as the computer you are carrying is as different from the one you used two decades ago. If you imagine that the front page of your daily newspaper represents the total area of Alaska the footprint of energy development in a small section of ANWR would be represented by a single letter on that front page – 2,000 acres.

October 19, 2005

> We are also committed to the standard that oil and gas exploration, development and production activities in the 1002 area will result in no significant adverse effect on fish, wildlife or their habitat, subsistence resources and the environment. We will ensure that this standard is met, **<u>or no development will take place</u>**. (emphasis added)

A Success Story: Balancing Environmental Protection with America's Energy Needs

North Slope development, far more intense than any potential Coastal Plain development, has not resulted in any devastating impacts. Polar bears, for example, have thrived in the region since 1967. A National Academy of Sciences (NAS) report found that there have been no serious effects or accumulation of effects on polar bears resulting from North Slope activities.

A National Research Council study, *Cumulative Environmental Effects of Oil and Gas Activities on Alaska's North Slope*, found that for:

- **Polar Bears:** "Industrial activity in marine waters of the Beaufort Sea has been limited and sporadic and likely has not caused serious cumulative effects on ringed seals or polar bears."

- **Caribou:** "For the past 50 or 60 years, all four [caribou] herds have been exposed to oil and gas exploration activity, but only the [Central Arctic Herd] has been in regular and direct contact with surface development related to oil production and transport….The [Central Arctic Herd] has increased from around 5,000 animals in the late 1970s to its current (2000) size of 27,000."

- **Muskoxen:** "No effects of seismic exploration on muskoxen have been detected to date."

- **Porcupine Caribou:** "To date, oil and gas activities have had little influence on the Porcupine Herd… ."

In the last year, the Senate has twice approved exploration in ANWR. To filibuster against it now would be nonsensical.

Return to the top

INHOFE COMMENTS ON NEW ESA LEGISLATION

Welcomes Contributions to the Discussion on How to Move ESA Modernization Forward

Sen. James Inhofe (R-Okla.), Chairman of the Environment & Public Works Committee, today issued the following statement about new legislation introduced by Sens. Mike Crapo (R-Idaho) and Blanche Lincoln (D-Ark.) intended to update the Endangered Species Act:

"After 30 years of implementation, members of Congress on both sides of the aisle have to come agree that the Endangered Species Act is in need of improvement, and I welcome the contributions of Senators Crapo and Lincoln to the discussion as to how we can move forward.

"The fact that we have recovered only 10 species of 1,300 listed is proof that aspects of the current law are not working and thus warrant a thorough review.

We've learned much through improvements in the science and have developed better methods for management over the last three decades, so it is time to apply that knowledge to improve the return on this important investment of our resources.

"I appreciate Chairman Pombo's hard work in the House, and look forward to working with my colleagues on the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee as we draft comprehensive legislation to modernize the Endangered Species Act."

Return to the top

OPENING STATEMENT OF CHAIRMAN JAMES M. INHOFE: HEARING ON EPA'S SPILL PREVENTION CONTROL AND COUNTERMEASURE PROGRAM

December 14, 2005

Today we are here to discuss the EPA's Spill Prevention Control and Countermeasure rule. As many of you know, I have been following this rule for several years and have written to the Agency numerous times, mainly to express concern with the direction the program was taking. It is very important that we look at this program objectively. No one in this room wants more oil spills. In fact, those who are with us today to express concerns about this rule lose money if they spill oil. They either sell it as a commodity or have bought it to run their businesses. All they ask for are reasonable regulations that address real problems and can be implemented with minimal but justifiable costs. I honestly don't think that is too much to ask of the federal government.

This program is the worst of one-size-fits all government. There are certain measures that should be taken at large facilities that are equal to the risk associated with a potential spill from those facilities. But why would we apply the same standard to a small facility with a very small risk of spilling? Why would we apply the same standard to completely different industries? Part of the problem with this rule is that EPA is trying to cover virtually every industry someone can think of with one rule and its making for very bad government and very bad policy.

What is most egregious about this rule is the utter lack of data to back it up. There is simply no data to defend the inclusion of farms or the air transport industry under the rule. Further, there is limited data to justify many of the proposed changes that affect other industries. Again, no one here today is seeking to have more spills. We simply want federal regulations to address real, identifiable, proven problems. The 2002 rule does not do that. The 1973 rule does not do that.

That is why the EPA has proposed the rule it did today which is an incomplete but appropriate step in the right direction. The rule correctly extends the compliance deadline for farming operations with a storage capacity of less than 10,000 gallons. However that extension is limited to the 2002 requirements

leaving in place the onerous 1973 rule for farmers. The approach to farmers has been the exact opposite of how our government should work. We should first identify a problem and then write a law or a regulation. Instead EPA wrote a regulation to cover farmers and is now trying to identify the problem.

The proposed rule does correctly provide much needed relief to the air transport industry. The sized secondary containment requirements do not make sense at airports. They could create safety and fire hazards and would unnecessarily cause logjams on the runways.

Unfortunately, the rule does little to assist small oil producers. First, by reinterpreting its wastewater treatment exemption, EPA will bring under the rule for the first time natural gas wells by arguing that produced water is in fact an oil. Secondly, the 10,000 gallon threshold outlined today does nothing to help small producers who often have storage capacity far above that because these wells at one time produced far more oil. I look forward to working with EPA to address the concerns of the small producers that make up the backbone of the nation's energy industry.

Again, some might be narrow in incorrectly arguing today that we are trying to make it easier to have oil spills. But family farmers do not want oil spills because they live on the land and are paying a lot for fuel. Brent Cummings from Oklahoma runs a family-owned business with 8 employees. He certainly doesn't want more oil spills. People like Mr. Cummings lose money when they lose oil. We simply must have reasonable regulations at reasonable costs that can be thoroughly defended with sound data. To date, that has not been the case with the SPCC program.

Return to the top

INHOFE STATEMENT ON CLINTON SPEECH IN MONTREAL

Last Friday, Chairman Inhofe issued the following statement in the wake of remarks made by former President Bill Clinton's in Montreal during the United Nations Conference on Climate Change:

"It is astonishing to me that former President Clinton, the same President Clinton who refused to submit the Kyoto Treaty to the United States Senate for ratification, today attacked President Bush for his approach to climate change. Even more astonishing is that the former President defended the 'Kyoto approach,' now recognized by the international community as a failure. Instead of being trapped in the failed Kyoto politics of the past, I continue to support President Bush's approach of continued scientific research and commitment to developing new technologies."

Return to the top

IN CASE YOU MISSED IT…

Investor's Business Daily

Kyoto's Bill

December 13, 2005

…[Former President] Clinton also failed to note [in Montreal] that so great was his faith in the need for Kyoto that he never submitted the treaty for ratification after signing it in 1998. He knew then what he won't acknowledge now: that Kyoto couldn't be ratified because it was all pain and no gain.

On July 25, 1997 -- Clinton's watch -- the U.S. Senate voted 95 to 0 for a resolution saying the U.S. should not be a signatory to Kyoto. The main reason was that the treaty exempted developing countries and major polluters like China and India.

The resolution stated that "the Senate strongly believes that the proposals under negotiation, because of the disparity in treatment" between industrialized and developing nations "and the level of required emission reductions, could result in serious harm to the United States economy, including significant job loss, trade disadvantages, increased energy and consumer costs."

In July 1998, Tom Wigley of the National Center for Atmospheric Research calculated that Kyoto, if implemented on a consistent basis by all industrial countries, would avert only 0.07 degrees Celsius of global warming by 2050, an amount too small to matter or even verify.

In October 1998, the U.S. Energy Information Agency estimated that for this imperceptible reduction, the U.S. gross domestic product would be reduced by as much as $397 billion annually. …

Rather than chasing phantom and temporary reductions in what many consider to be a natural and cyclical phenomenon, money wasted on Kyoto enforcement could be better spent.

Bjorn Lomborg, Danish statistician and author of "The Skeptical Environmentalist," once said: "For less than one year of (the cost of) meeting Kyoto, we could provide clean water and sanitation for all of the developing world forever."

We'll drink to that.

Click here for the full text of the editorial.

Return to the top

The Leader-Post [Regina, Saskatchewan]

Martin will do anything to hold on to power

December 13, 2005

By Lee Morrison, Special to The Leader-Post

CALGARY -- Until quite recently, I considered Paul Martin to be merely a veracity challenged but otherwise harmless windbag.

I couldn't have been more wrong. On two successive days last week, Dec. 7 and Dec. 8, he displayed a lack of scruples and a level of chippiness rarely seen among people in leadership positions. He is a politician's politician in the most pejorative sense -- a man who volubly professes to "love Canada" but, in reality, will say anything and do anything to stay in power, regardless of the consequences.

At the United Nations Climate Change Conference in Montreal, he enthusiastically endorsed the Kyoto Accord even though the "science" behind it has been largely discredited. With his personal staff of about 200, it is inconceivable that he hasn't had access to the scientific rebuttals (much of it by Canadian scholars) to this gigantic fraud.

Actually, long before independent climate experts became interested in the subject, the entire Kyoto exercise was predicated on misrepresentation of the Report of the U.N.'s Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) which states:

> 1.) That none of the studies have shown clear evidence that we can attribute observed climate changes to increases in greenhouse gases;
>
> 2.) That no study has positively attributed all or part of climate change to man-made causes.

The public, and politicians who could, in those days, still plead ignorance, were exposed only to the report's blatantly political summary, to which the committee scientists had minimal input.

Martin can no longer be unaware of the facts any more than he could have been unaware of the boodle going out the door during the sponsorship scandal. Nevertheless, he is happy to ride the wave of mass hysteria and pander to public misconceptions by promising to "do something" about the non-problem at any economic or social cost. He knows where the votes are and the country be damned.

To compound his shamelessness, he then indulged in the good old Canadian political pastime of trolling for votes by bad-mouthing the U.S.A. for failing to leap into the Kyoto trap.

Ironically, since 1990, Canada's annual carbon dioxide emissions have increased by 24 per cent whereas the nasty Yankees have increased theirs by only 13 per cent -- not because they have been converted to the new religion but because, with dwindling oil supplies, they are becoming serious about energy efficiency.

American delegates were deeply offended by some of his remarks. Our Ambassador to Washington, Frank McKenna, was called in for a chat but, what the heck, publicly kicking a neighbour with which we already have strained relations was great domestic politics. … .

Click here for the full text of the op-ed.

Return to the top

The New York Sun

Defining Prosperity Down

December 14, 2005

By Jack Kemp

The United States government has wisely refused to yield to pressure by other industrialized nations to enter into formal negotiations that would create new binding limits on so-called "greenhouse-gas" emissions to take effect in 2012. The government did, however, agree to engage in "open and nonbinding" discussions with 200 other nations on global warming and carbon dioxide emissions.

The Bush administration deserves enormous credit for resisting this thinly disguised attempt to disadvantage America economically under the pretext of environmentalism and the pseudo-science of global warming. Scientists cannot even agree on whether global temperatures are rising, falling or staying the same, much less find scientific consensus on what might account for any changes in average temperatures. The administration should use these discussions to unmask the hostile, anti-American agenda that lies beneath this nonsense. …

Britain's chief scientific adviser Sir David King bellows, "Global warming is a greater threat than terrorism" and "Antarctica is likely to be the world's only habitable continent by the end of this century if global warming remains unchecked." Yet the only basis for these claims - The Washington Post proclaimed that global warming constitutes "one of the world's most far-reaching problems" - is a set of computer-model predictions.

The only problem is, the computer-model predictions are not backed up by independent data from weather satellites and balloons, which show no appreciable warming of the atmosphere. Worse yet, the same computer models that predict catastrophic global warming in the future also "predict" current climatic conditions almost the opposite of those that actually prevail. The computer models on which global-warming doomsayers rely insist the climate in the middle troposphere, i.e., above the surface, should be warming at the rate of about one degree Fahrenheit per decade right now.

If the models don't even square with what's going on now in the real world,

how can any reasonable person place confidence in what they predict for the future, especially if taking action based on those dubious predictions means inflicting incredible damage on the economy and consigning people to a declining standard of living? …

[Bill] McKibben revealed the real agenda behind Kyoto and its progeny when he said, "The goal of the 21st century must somehow be to simultaneously develop the economies of the poorest parts of the world and undevelop those of the rich - to transfer enough technology and wealth that we're able to meet somewhere in the middle."

Global warming is not really about the global climate at all; it's about global government turning the whole world into Old Europe or stagnating Japan. This most recent round of eco-hysteria - along with its predecessors - is simply a thinly veiled effort to do by international treaty, and eventually global government, what Communism failed to do, namely define global prosperity down in the name of "equality." The Bush administration is doing the right thing by standing astride the rush to environmental extremism and calling "stop."

Click here for the full text of the op-ed.

Bill Holbrook, Communications Director
Matt Dempsey, Deputy Press Secretary